

ITEMS

VOLUME 10 • NUMBER 1 • MARCH 1956
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

GRANTS FOR FIELD STUDIES OF POLITICAL GROUPS:

A NEW PROGRAM OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMPARATIVE POLITICS

A PROGRAM of grants to individual scholars for field studies of political groups during the academic years 1957-58 and 1958-59 is to be offered by the Social Science Research Council, as a part of a five-year program of the Council's Committee on Comparative Politics.¹ Financial support for this new program has been provided by a grant to the Council from the Ford Foundation.

Applications for grants will be reviewed by the Committee on Comparative Politics, which will give preference to proposals for studies of political groups and processes in foreign areas where field research is feasible but our knowledge of these phenomena is inadequate. In developing its program the committee has found the study of political groups one of the most rewarding approaches to the problem of political comparison, in our present state of limited knowledge. Whether these groups are political parties and interest groups in the Western sense, whether they constitute parts of the formal governmental structure, or whether they include traditional entities such as powerful families or tribal groups, all have in common the functions of aggregating, reconciling, and compelling political choices and

transforming them into public policies. To study these groups, the roles they play in politics, their values and the goals they seek through politics, their relations to different elements in the society and to each other, and the ways in which they control or influence the formal governmental agencies, is to study the political process. More detailed statements of the committee's views and approach may be found in articles prepared by its two subcommittees and published in the December 1955 issue of the *American Political Science Review*.²

The five-year program of the committee, of which the field work phase is to be carried out through grants to individuals in 1957-58 and 1958-59, will be concerned not only with increasing knowledge of foreign political processes, but also with encouraging the selection of common problems for research and the use of common methods in order to assure comparability of the results of field studies. The committee will prepare materials suggesting problems for research and appropriate methods. It will hold conferences for the purpose of discussing its approach and the findings of field studies made under its auspices. At the conclusion of the field work phase of its program the committee will sponsor a series of analytical studies, based in part on the results of the field research, on such subjects as the sociology of political parties, religion and politics, business groups and politics, students and politics.

Applicants for grants must possess the Ph.D. degree

¹ The members of this committee are Gabriel A. Almond, Princeton University (chairman); Raymond A. Bauer, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Taylor Cole, Duke University; James S. Coleman, University of California, Los Angeles; George McT. Kahin, Cornell University; Roy C. Macridis, Northwestern University; Guy J. Pauker, Harvard University; Lucian W. Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; staff, Bryce Wood. The committee was appointed early in 1954 to define the special characteristics, techniques, and values of comparative methods as applied to the study of politics, and to plan for the advancement of research in this field. See "Research in Comparative Politics: Plans of a New Council Committee," by Gabriel A. Almond, *Items*, March 1954, pp. 1-4.

² George McT. Kahin, Guy J. Pauker, and Lucian W. Pye, "Comparative Politics of Non-Western Countries," pp. 1022-1041; and Gabriel A. Almond, Taylor Cole, and Roy C. Macridis, "A Suggested Research Strategy in Western European Government and Politics," pp. 1042-1049.

or its equivalent, and be prepared to undertake field research within the scope of the committee's concern, in specific foreign areas. One of the purposes of the program is to afford opportunities for field study to individuals who are not associated with research institutes. An effort will be made to distribute the awards among the major foreign areas, such as Western Europe, Southeast and South Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, although not necessarily in equal numbers.

Awards may be made to provide for carrying out a complete field program from planning to the completion of a final written report, or to cover only the planning phase, the field work, or the analysis of materials and preparation of a report, when the remainder of an applicant's program is to be financed from other sources.

Hence the amounts of grants are not fixed: the stipend will be determined in each case by the committee on the basis of a statement of needs to be submitted by the applicant. Proposals for grants may include provision for maintenance, travel, and research expenses. In general, the maximum grant might include the equivalent of salary for not more than 18 months besides allowances for travel and research expenses.

Application forms may be obtained from the Washington office of the Social Science Research Council, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., and inquiries should be addressed to that office. Applications for support of field work during 1957-58 should be received by the Washington office not later than November 15, 1956.

PERCEPTION OF PERSONS: REPORT OF THE INTERUNIVERSITY SUMMER RESEARCH SEMINAR*

THE seminar, which met at Harvard University from June 21 to August 12, 1955, was concerned with research on perception of persons as a process involved in ordinary human interaction. We were concerned not with the person as an object to be diagnosed but with perception of persons as it occurs in, and as it affects, everyday life.¹ As expressed by one member, we were interested in "naïve psychology" rather than in psychodiagnosis. We assumed that this psychology would have its own regularities, and its systematic bearing upon interpersonal behavior.

We faced, first, the question of how perception of persons differs from perception of objects. As a physical stimulus a person is not essentially different from other stimuli. But insofar as, through information gained via perception, inferences are made about an object's properties and potentialities that are not immediately observed, persons are indeed special objects, for persons have *psychological* properties. When we speak of perception of persons, or of knowledge of persons, we refer to

the observations we make about *intentions, attitudes, emotions, ideas, abilities, purposes, traits*, etc. We make these observations as we follow the *actions* of persons, among other events, but we formulate these actions in terms that are strictly psychological. Instead of describing the sheer sequence of bodily movements of a person, we say that he is fearful, boastful, hesitant, aggressive.

Underlying this mode of comprehending human action is our capacity to note that the person whose actions are being followed has within him a representation of his environment, and that his actions are mediated by the representations that he forms. We know he is capable of watching, of perceiving. Thus the other person appears in our experience as directing himself toward us, with intentions, attitudes, and feelings.

These conditions of perception form the basis for the interaction between one person and another. In this situation *both* persons have a phenomenal representation of the environment. Each observes that the other directs himself toward him; each can make known to the other that he is sensitive to the other's direction toward himself. These operations provide the basis for what has been called the "mutually shared field" in interaction between persons, which is the prerequisite for all social processes.

The seminar proposed, therefore, to speak of perception or cognition of persons with reference to any instance in which the perceiver *regards* the object as hav-

* The members of the seminar were Solomon E. Asch, Professor of Psychology, Swarthmore College; Nathan L. Gage, Associate Professor of Education, University of Illinois; William L. Hays, Instructor in Psychology, University of Michigan; Fritz Heider, Professor of Psychology, University of Kansas; William F. Soskin, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Chicago; and Renato Tagiuri, Lecturer and Research Associate, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University. Mr. Tagiuri served as chairman of the seminar.

¹ Clearly, we are using perception in an extremely loose way, most often meaning apperception and cognition.

ing the potential of representation and intentionality. This left us free to include entities other than persons to which these properties are occasionally ascribed. The seminar then proceeded to discuss a selected group of relevant topics, and the present report is limited to the resulting conclusions and impressions that seem most important for future research on perception of persons.

SPECIFICATION OF THE STIMULUS

How to specify the stimulus conditions when the objects of perception and cognition are persons is a question basic to investigation and one that presents problems not usually encountered in other fields of psychological research. The usual procedure of coordinating the phenomenal datum with the stimulus defined in physical terms, or with the pattern of sensory excitation on a receptor organ, is for a number of reasons not feasible or desirable in perception of persons. Here the concern is, as a rule, with the stimulus conditions that correspond to the cognition of intentions, attitudes, traits, and motives. For example, the judgment that a person is "kindly" is not based on one specific stimulus constellation. Rather, conclusions about his "kindliness" are drawn on the basis of the most diverse observations—of appearance, gestures, actions that differ from one another radically, and contexts that are equally diversified. Further, the events that produce the judgment of "kindliness" in any single situation are most often too complex to be described in terms of their physical properties.

One possibility is to start with the "perceived stimuli," and to coordinate these with the further cognitive judgments they generate. Actions such as approaching, chasing, giving, taking, hitting are the data with which the investigator usually must start. These raw materials of our observation of persons may be considered the more immediate phenomenal data whose analysis leads to conclusions about intentions, traits, and so on. In certain relatively simple settings it may also be possible to study the responsible physical conditions, as Michotte and Heider have done.² When the events are too complex for this form of description, the focus of research may shift to the relations between the phenomenal data and the inferences concerning motives or character traits that may be drawn from them.

There is considerable agreement among social psychologists concerning what we have called the perceived

stimulus, and the proposed procedure of analysis may be fruitful, despite the failure to specify the stimulus conditions in physical dimensions. The investigator, of course, is not free from the necessity of specifying the phenomenal stimuli in suitable psychological dimensions. This is largely a task for the future, however, for at the present time only the grossest categories are available for describing what is cognized.

THE PLACE OF PHENOMENAL DATA

If we admit the decisive role of the "perceived stimulus," we commit ourselves to the study of a great range of phenomenal data. The commitment increases if we also include the range of concepts pertaining to motives and attitudes in terms of which we order and stabilize the highly vicarious data of the more immediate aspects of interpersonal experience. This approach is at variance with those research programs that envision establishing direct relations between the actions of one person and the consequent reactions of another, both described in physical terms. The latter effort appears parsimonious and objective and has the merit of concentrating on concrete details of action and reaction, but in the view of the seminar this simplification cannot be achieved if it is held that action is directed in terms of concepts about interpersonal relations, and therefore is to be similarly understood.

"ACCURACY" OF PERCEPTION

The great majority of published studies in the field of social perception have dealt with the ability of people to perceive accurately personality traits of other persons. These studies, which are modeled after the investigation of cognition by the testing of intelligence, are limited in several respects. They consider as objects of perception mainly the personality traits of other people. In cognition of the social environment, the assessment of the enduring qualities of other people may not always be the most important feature. Often, behavior is determined primarily by the cognition of other people's intentions, wishes, actions, sentiments, beliefs, norms, etc.

Furthermore, past studies have tended to focus on the over-all achievement and abilities of the perceiver. Just as intelligence testing has to be supplemented by investigations of the process of thinking, so in social perception there is need for studying the processes involved when one person cognizes the intentions, traits, or other aspects of another. The aims and methods may have to be different from those involved in the testing of ability in social perception. Instead of using the ready-made concepts of practical life, e.g., the concept of

²Fritz Heider and Marianne A. Simmel, "A Study of Apparent Behavior," *American Journal of Psychology*, 57:243-259 (1944); Albert Michotte, "The Emotions Regarded as Functional Connections," in Martin L. Reymer, ed. *Feelings and Emotions* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950), pp. 114-126.

"accuracy" of social perception, one must try to ferret out the underlying variables that are relevant. Instead of concentrating on over-all measures comprising a number of diverse single situations or questions, one must concentrate on the conditions and effects in specific instances of social perceiving. And instead of psychometric methods, one must use the hypothetico-deductive methods of systematic experimentation. An investigator who has a hunch about the factors responsible for an impression concerning a person's intention, wish, or trait in a concrete instance of social perception will be able to control the independent variables in an experiment. Only a few studies have dealt with this problem, which would seem to be of primary importance for the construction of a theory of social cognition.

Despite its original purpose, research on "accuracy" of social perception has been fruitful of insights and suggestions as to the process by which persons are perceived. Finding the data yielded by "tests of accuracy" to be severely wanting in both theoretical and empirical validity, investigators have made careful analyses of the resulting accuracy scores. From this work have stemmed the idea of stereotypic or "cultural chance" accuracy, insights into the role played by real similarity and assumed similarity between the perceiver and the person perceived, and studies of the operation of favorable predispositions and implicit personality theories.

PERCEPTION OF PERSONS AND CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

While the seminar was not principally concerned with the task of the diagnostician, we could not avoid this topic when we discussed "accuracy," nor could we disregard the relevance of perception of persons for those whose work is personality diagnosis.

The appraisal of a patient by a diagnostician using his kit of tests or by a psychotherapist in successive interviews constitutes a process of evaluation not unlike that engaged in by any pair of strangers in the course of becoming acquainted. The task of the professional person differs in that he has available various, although perhaps equally restricted, samples of data on which to base his judgment; his evaluation must be broader in scope and hence runs the risk of going beyond limits justified by the information available; his concepts tend to be better suited for making general statements than for making predictions about specific situations; and by virtue of his very limited contact with his subject, the diagnostician lacks opportunity to learn from experience in correcting his errors. Both the layman and the professional person derive information from their data by reference to a set of expectations, based upon prior experiences that had immediate personal consequences,

upon secondhand knowledge and, for the professional, upon theoretical considerations.

Recent research findings suggest, however, that some theoretically derived expectations easily mislead judges in their appraisals and predictions or, in other words, that judges using a particular theoretical frame of reference may be thought of as entertaining biases which predispose them to certain types of errors. Hence it would seem that in seeking more accurate methods of diagnosis the clinical psychologist might well turn for a time from his concern with validating tests or identifying good judges, to study instead the process of formation of judgments on the basis of data of the clinical type.

At the same time, our understanding of problems of human adjustment would be furthered immeasurably by systematic investigation of causes of error in perception of persons in social situations, and of the allied orthopsychological problem of effecting changes in persistent misperceptions. Here, there is a very great gap between the theory derived from the insights of experienced psychotherapists and the findings in carefully controlled laboratory experiments with animal or human subjects. Only the rashest will claim that a theory is either proved or disproved on the basis of many present-day experiments in which the integrity of the phenomenon is sacrificed for the sake of rigorous control and convenience in analysis of data. The field is very much in need of ingeniously contrived investigations of perceptual processes in circumstances where the normal motivations and defenses of humans in life situations are left reasonably intact. Fortunately, research techniques and methods of analysis that are currently being developed promise to open precisely such possibilities.

Finally, it seems worth while to point out that just as the early behaviorists focused on the study of actions without reference to the perceptual and cognitive aspects of behavior, a current tendency is to study perception and cognition without reference to action. We know very little about the immediate determinants of an act in a social situation. Indeed, the logic of interpretation of projective tests is based on the assumption of a close relation between modes of perceiving or apperceiving and modes of acting, but we still know very little about the nature of this relationship, its limits, and qualifications. Two types of studies should be of particular value here: studies of the relation between responses to projective tests and specific actions in social situations, and studies of the relation between perception and responses in social situations. Such studies should of course be concerned with other kinds of variables, such as the motivations and the abilities of the perceiver, the relevance of the things perceived to the kinds of responses studied, the certainty of the perceiver about his perceptions,

and especially with the freedom of the perceiver from role constraints so that he can respond in terms of his perceptions.

MATHEMATICAL MODELS

It seems possible that even in the present early stage of theorizing, there may be value in preliminary attempts to construct more formal mathematical models of the relations underlying many phenomena of interpersonal perception. Contrary to the opinion of those who oppose such attempts at formalization on the grounds that it leads to premature "embalming" of a theoretical position, and that its simplifications are so extreme that all psychological meaning is lost, these effects need not ensue if the approach is correctly employed. It is true that evolving an abstract statement of a relation requires simplifying the concepts involved to their essentials. Nevertheless, this very feature of the use of abstract models can have a salutary effect in areas that, like interpersonal perception, deal in large part with extremely complex and ambiguous concepts. The necessity for careful scrutiny and severe pruning of our concepts, in order to fit them into a usable abstract system, may eliminate much that is mere verbiage and uncover hidden, but crucial, assumptions in our theorizing. And nothing provides such a clear target for constructive criticism as an oversimplified abstract statement of a theoretical relationship.

We do not imply that elaborate models need be constructed. In fact, in order to preserve the "qualitative" flavor of most of the current provisional concepts and theorizing, the limited but useful mathematics of set and relation theory may be appropriate. It is always possible to refine and strengthen provisional models as our knowledge grows.

Another, and more compelling, reason for undertaking this kind of careful examination of our concepts is the fact that we tacitly assume certain formal properties when we attempt to make measurements. The shining goal of an "exact" and "quantitative" science has tended to make us blind to our all too frequent practice of taking the measure as representing the thing measured. Hence our measurement operation is a *de facto* theory about our concepts. For example, we commonly measure in terms of equal units (such as fre-

quency of social contact) without ever inquiring about the *psychological* equivalence of a unit of the particular variable yielding the measure; we sum different indexes into a "score" without concern for the relatedness of the psychological dimensions that they represent; we scale and factor-analyze data, only half aware of the assumption of simple linear and monotonic relations between an individual's response and the relevant psychological variables. We may or may not wish to embody these assumptions in our theory; the point is that we almost always test our theory *in terms of such measures*, and hence in terms of such assumptions. A serious concern with the more formal properties of our concepts is essential if we are to avoid the haphazard introduction of assumptions concerning *measurement* that directly affect the test of the theory.

The area of social perception seems to call especially for the development of new measurement techniques and statistical methodology appropriate to qualitative data. The nonparametric statistics and some techniques derived from information theory are beginning to meet this need to some extent. However, it is important to distinguish between analytic techniques that avoid *statistical* assumptions, and the nonmetric or qualitative techniques that avoid assumptions about measurement.

Still another pressing need in this area is an adequate methodology for describing the differential responses of a *single* individual. It seems unduly sanguine to assume that all important relations must necessarily emerge even though the responses of individuals are combined into statistical aggregates.

SUMMARY

In summary, in the present state of knowledge of perception of persons, it might be most profitable if the striving for precise, quantitative operations were curtailed and we devoted ourselves to application of those techniques that permit us to deal with questions in the most nearly qualitative terms. Thus we might avoid the encumbrance of highly questionable measurement and statistical assumptions. On the other hand, effort might well be directed toward development of simple provisional models—admittedly crude—in the hope that through clarification of our thinking more elaborate and appropriate operational techniques will be suggested.

INTERUNIVERSITY SUMMER RESEARCH SEMINARS, 1956

THREE interuniversity summer research seminars will be held in 1956, under the program reinstituted in 1954 with support provided by the Rockefeller Foundation.

A seminar on theories of economic growth has been planned in detail during the past year by the Committee on Economic Growth and will be held at Dartmouth College. Theoretical positions as well as policy formulations will be examined by the seminar, and it will attempt to identify the types of social and political arrangements that have been described in the relevant literature as influencing long-term economic growth favorably or unfavorably. Papers are being prepared by all participants in advance, and it is hoped that when revised in the light of the seminar discussions these contributions may merit publication as a volume. The participants and the topics of their papers are:

Henry J. Bruton, Assistant Professor of Economics, Yale University: Some Recent Models of Long-Term Economic Growth

Evsey D. Domar, Associate Professor of Political Economy, Johns Hopkins University: Theories of Economic Growth as Represented in Recent Publications of the United Nations and Other International Agencies

Alexander Erlich, Visiting Lecturer in Economics, Columbia University: Theories of Economic Growth in Marxian and Post-Marxian (including Soviet) Writings

Bert F. Hoselitz, Lecturer in Economics, University of Chicago: Economic Growth Theories of the School of Historical Economics

J. M. Letiche, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of California, Berkeley: The Classical Theory of Economic Growth

Joseph J. Spengler, Professor of Economics, Duke University: Economic Growth in Mercantilist and Physiocratic Theory

Herbert Zassenhaus, Senior Economist, International Monetary Fund: Economic Growth in Neoclassical Theory.

A seminar on American diplomatic history, to be held at Duke University from June 4 to July 28, 1956, will be particularly concerned with research on isolation and collective security in twentieth century American diplomacy. The procedure that has been agreed upon for this seminar is similar to that adopted by the Committee on Economic Growth, calling for advance preparation of papers by each participant, their discussion and revision during the summer, and possible publication in one volume. The participants and the research topics assigned to them are:

Alexander DeConde, Assistant Professor of History, Duke University (chairman of the seminar): The Idea of Isolation and the Ideas of Historians

William R. Allen, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of California, Los Angeles: Cordell Hull, Foreign Policy, and the Defense of the Trade Agreements Program, 1934-41

Richard N. Current, Professor of History, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina: The Idea of Collective Security

Robert H. Ferrell, Assistant Professor of History, Indiana University: The Organized Peace Movement, 1918-39

William L. Neumann, Associate Professor of History, Goucher College: Ambivalence and Dissonance in American Thought on the Far East

J. Chalmers Vinson, Associate Professor of History, University of Georgia: The Idea of Force in American Foreign Policy, 1918-39

Kenneth W. Thompson, Assistant Director, Social Science Program, Rockefeller Foundation (part-time participant for consultation on the political science approach to the seminar subject).

A seminar on differential culture change, to be held at the University of New Mexico, will take its departure from work done at the 1953 seminar on acculturation.¹ The 1956 seminar will attempt to develop a cross-cultural analytical scheme, to apply it to diverse North American Indian cultures on which adequate data are available, and to isolate general propositions that might be useful in future research on differential culture change. Edward H. Spicer, Professor of Anthropology, University of Arizona, will serve as chairman of the seminar, and Edward M. Bruner, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Yale University, will act as secretary. The other members will be Helen Codere, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Vassar College; Edward P. Dozier, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Northwestern University; David French, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Reed College; Evon Z. Vogt, Associate Professor of Social Anthropology, Harvard University (who also attended the 1953 seminar). Ronald Kurtz, a graduate student in anthropology at the University of New Mexico, will serve as recorder.

¹ A report on this work, "Acculturation: An Exploratory Formulation," by Leonard Broom, Bernard J. Siegel, Evon Z. Vogt, and James B. Watson, may be found in the *American Anthropologist*, December 1954, pp. 973-1002.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

BUSINESS ENTERPRISE RESEARCH

Howard R. Bowen (chairman), Mary Jean Bowman, J. Keith Butters, Robert Dubin, Albert G. Hart, George Katona, Herbert A. Simon, George W. Stocking, J. Fred Weston.

A major conference on research on expectations, uncertainty, and business behavior was held at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, Graduate School of Industrial Administration, on October 27-29, 1955, in accordance with plans developed by Mary Jean Bowman in consultation with the committee. This was conceived as the first of a series of interdisciplinary conferences on alternative ways of studying business behavior; and the participants, numbering about 40, were drawn from the fields of economics, social psychology, and sociology, and their specialized subfields. Some 16 papers were prepared and circulated to the conference participants in advance. The sessions began with formal discussions also prepared in advance, statements by the authors of papers followed, and then there was discussion from the floor. The topics of the sessions were: the concepts of expectations, uncertainty, and surprise; psychosocial frames of reference in the study of the role of expectations in business behavior; approaches to the empirical study of business expectations, plans, and behavior; psychosocial factors in managerial response to uncertainty; surveys of expectations, plans, and investment behavior; industry studies in the patterning of expectations and of response to uncertainty; evaluation of the conference. Howard R. Bowen served as chairman of the sessions. Mary Jean Bowman is engaged in revising and integrating the conference papers for publication in a unified volume.

CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

Ralph G. Hurlin (chairman), Robert W. Burgess, John D. Durand, Ernest M. Fisher, F. F. Hill, Frederick F. Stephan, Conrad Taeuber, Ralph J. Watkins, Paul Webbink.

Two additional monographs in the series sponsored by the committee and the Bureau of the Census are scheduled for early publication by John Wiley & Sons: *Immigrants and Their Children, 1850-1950*, by Edward P. Hutchinson, in April; and *Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950*, by Otis Dudley Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., in June. At a meeting on February 3 the committee formulated plans directed toward completion of its work by the end of the calendar year, with the expectation that at least 15 of the 18 monographs undertaken in the series will have been issued by mid-1957.

CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION

Ralph L. Beals (chairman), Cora Du Bois, Herbert H. Hyman, Ronald Lippitt, Charles P. Loomis; staff, M. Brewster Smith, Joseph B. Casagrande.

With its program of research on academic exchange of persons nearing completion, the committee arranged a con-

ference on January 20, at which its procedures and achievements were reviewed with representatives of the foundations that provided support for the program and of other especially interested agencies. John W. Bennett of Ohio State University, Stuart W. Cook of New York University, and Richard T. Morris of the University of California, Los Angeles, described and summarized the results of the projects under their respective direction as illustrative of the committee's approach. Discussion was particularly concerned with needs for further research.

Monographs reporting on research sponsored by the committee are to be published by the University of Minnesota Press. The first two volumes in the series, *The American Experience of Swedish Students: Retrospect and Aftermath* by Franklin D. Scott, and *Indian Students on an American Campus* by Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler, are in press. Reports on some aspects of the projects carried out at Cornell University, New York University, and the University of California, Los Angeles, during 1954-55 are included in "Attitudes and Adjustment in Cross-Cultural Contact: Recent Studies of Foreign Students," *Journal of Social Issues*, No. 1, 1956, which also contains a revised version of the memorandum, "A Perspective for Further Research," prepared by M. Brewster Smith for the January conference.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Richard Hartshorne, Melville J. Herskovits, Edgar M. Hoover, Bert F. Hoselitz, Wilbert E. Moore, Joseph J. Spengler.

Plans for extending the committee's program of comparative studies of long-term records of the economic growth of foreign countries (described by the chairman in *Items*, December 1955, pp. 42-46) with projects in Denmark, France, Germany, and Japan were approved at a meeting of the committee on February 24-25. An analysis of the factors in the economic growth of Denmark reflected by the long-term income and employment records already available will be undertaken at the Institute of Economics and History, University of Copenhagen. A comprehensive study of relevant French data will be made by Jan Marczewski under the sponsorship of the Institut de Science Economique Appliquée in Paris. A study of long-term trends in the distribution of income by size in the several German states, and in Germany as a whole, will be undertaken by J. Heinz Müller at the University of Freiburg. An analysis of Japanese data will be made by Henry Rosovsky in connection with other studies on which he will be engaged in Japan as a junior fellow of Harvard University.

At the February meeting final arrangements were also made for a conference on the relation of the state to economic growth, to be held in New York next October, and for a conference on the choice of technology in economic development, to be held in the spring of 1957 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology under the joint

sponsorship of its Center for International Studies and the committee.

A paper by Phyllis Deane, "The Implications of Early National Income Estimates for the Measurement of Long-Term Economic Growth in the United Kingdom," prepared as part of the study undertaken for the committee at the University of Cambridge Department of Applied Economics, was published in the November 1955 issue of *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. Reprints are available from the New York office of the Council. *Economic Growth: Brazil, India, Japan*, a volume edited by Messrs. Kuznets, Moore, and Spengler and comprising revisions of the papers prepared for a conference held by the committee in 1952, was published by the Duke University Press late in 1955. The Center for International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has just published *Investment Criteria and Economic Growth*, consisting of six papers written for the conference sponsored jointly by the Center and the committee in October 1954. The papers on the growth of national income or wealth in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Denmark, Hungary, and Japan, prepared originally for the 1953 meeting of the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth at Castelfandolfo, Italy, have been edited by Mr. Kuznets and published for the Association as its *Income and Wealth, Series V*, by Bowes & Bowes, London.

The 1956 interuniversity summer research seminar on theories of economic growth, planned by the committee, is described on page 6 supra.

LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Dale Yoder (chairman), Neil W. Chamberlain, Philip M. Hauser, John B. Lansing, Charles A. Myers, Gladys L. Palmer, Carroll L. Shartle, Robert Tannenbaum.

With the Industrial Relations Center of the University of Minnesota the committee is co-sponsoring a further conference on industrial relations research to be held at the University in May. The conference will be concerned with experience acquired thus far with comparative studies of labor problems in economic development, of wage structures and collective bargaining, and of management in several foreign countries, and will attempt to assess the implications of these studies for more systematic research in industrial relations in this country and abroad. The committee is continuing its examination of various ways of planning and stimulating research on family employment patterns in the structure and functioning of the labor market, and on family income and expenditure patterns.

LINGUISTICS AND PSYCHOLOGY

Rulon S. Wells (chairman), John B. Carroll, James J. Jenkins, Alvin M. Liberman, Floyd G. Lounsbury, Charles E. Osgood, Thomas A. Sebeok; staff, Joseph B. Casagrande.

Continuing the work of the research training and planning seminar held during July and August 1955 at the University of New Mexico, plans are currently being made

for the second phase of the committee's Southwest Project in Comparative Psycholinguistics, namely, the field research. Five research teams, each including both linguists and psychologists, have been formed to work respectively with Navaho, Zuni, Hopi, Spanish American, and Hopi-Tewa (including the Rio Grande Tewa) languages and cultures. The collection in the field of experimental and observational data on language behavior of these Southwestern groups will begin this spring and continue throughout the summer. As a guide for the research teams, and to secure greater comparability of data, a field manual of experimental procedures has been prepared under the editorship of John B. Carroll, the project director, and Susan M. Ervin. After more experience is gained in the field, it is expected that a revised version of the manual will be made available to persons wishing to undertake psycholinguistic research among various other groups.

Plans have also been made by the committee to hold the fourth in a series of two-day work conferences on significant substantive, methodological, or theoretical issues in the general field of psycholinguistics. In May a small group of linguists, philosophers, and psychologists will participate in a conference on "Dimensions of Meaning: Analytic and Experimental Approaches." The conference is being organized by Rulon S. Wells and will be held at Yale University. Previous conferences sponsored by the committee have dealt with problems of bilingualism, techniques of content analysis, and associative processes in verbal behavior.

MIGRATION DIFFERENTIALS

Dorothy S. Thomas (chairman), Donald J. Bogue, Margaret J. Hagood, C. Horace Hamilton, E. P. Hutchinson, Benjamin Malzberg, Henry S. Shryock, Jr.; staff, Everett S. Lee.

Migration and Mental Disease: A Study of First Admissions to Hospitals for Mental Disease, New York, 1939-1941, a monograph by Benjamin Malzberg and Everett S. Lee, with an Introduction by Dorothy S. Thomas, is scheduled for publication by the Council late in March. The analysis reported in this monograph was undertaken in connection with the committee's main project—revision of Council Bulletin 43, *Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials* (1938)—for two reasons: (1) the continuing lack of knowledge, revealed in reviewing the literature published since 1938, concerning the relations between migration and mental disease and personality disorder; and (2) the desirability of demonstrating the methodological possibilities in utilizing the data on characteristics of the population by 5-year migration status from the 1940 census and by states of birth and of residence from the 1950 census for analyses of migration differentials. With the completion of this supplementary project, preparation of the revision of Bulletin 43 has been resumed. The manuscript by Mr. Lee and contributions by members of the committee are expected to be reviewed at a meeting of the committee in the late summer.

PREVENTIVE MEDICINE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Hugh R. Leavell (chairman), H. van Zile Hyde, Stanley H. King, Benjamin D. Paul, Lyle Saunders, Leo W. Simmons, John M. Weir, Donald Young; *staff*, Robert N. Wilson.

After reviewing the converging interests of specialists in preventive medicine and research workers in various social science fields, the committee in November 1954 decided to focus its efforts on developing the possibilities for cooperative research in these areas of convergence. As a first step experts in selected areas were invited to prepare working papers or research memoranda analyzing important problems and methods of inquiry in their fields, for discussion by small conferences. Five conferences have been devoted to analysis of such research memoranda: "Medical Institutions in Sociological Perspective," by Albert F. Wessen of Yale University was discussed in January 1955; "Intercultural Health Programs," by George M. Foster of the University of California, in June; "The Community and Its Processes in Relation to Health and Health Programs," by Walter E. Boek of the New York State Department of Health, in October; "Some Effects of Social and Cultural Systems in Reactions to Stress," by William Caudill of Harvard University, and "Stress," by Stewart Wolf of the University of Oklahoma, in November; "Class, Status, and Public Health," by Ozzie G. Simmons of Harvard University, on March 6, 1956. In these memoranda the authors have emphasized potential research opportunities and techniques which deserve attention. Both the papers and the conference discussions have attempted to define productive relations that might be developed between the two broad groups of specialists involved. Other areas being considered for similar conferences are health economics, and the socio-

medical mapping of health data. The committee is contemplating the preparation of a volume of research planning papers, drawing on some of the memoranda already prepared or anticipated, after they have been revised on the basis of the conference discussions and other comments.

RESEARCH TRAINING

Everett C. Hughes (chairman), G. Heberton Evans, Jr., Henry W. Riecken, Evon Z. Vogt, Payson S. Wild; *staff*, Elbridge Sibley.

An experimental research training seminar will be held from June 18 to August 10, 1956 at the University of Oregon under the direction of Robin M. Williams, Jr. of Cornell University and with the collaboration of the Council. Support has been given to the seminar in the hope that it will demonstrate new possibilities for predoctoral research training which may be of interest to other institutions. Under Mr. Williams' direction the students in the seminar will function as co-workers in an actual research undertaking, which will be carried out from initial planning through detailed field work and the preparation of a written report of the findings. The research project will be concerned with relationships between certain personal values held by individuals and their patterns of social participation and interaction. Data will be collected by interviews with adults in selected neighborhoods in and around Eugene, to test several hypotheses derived from recent research in social psychology and sociology. Enrollment in the seminar is limited to 15 students who will be selected on the basis of applications to the Department of Sociology at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.

For lists of attendants at the 1956 summer research training institutes sponsored by the committee, see pages 10-11 *infra*.

PERSONNEL

DIRECTORS OF THE COUNCIL

The following persons have been designated by the seven national social science organizations associated with the Council to serve as directors of the Council for the three-year term 1956-58:

- E. Adamson Hoebel, University of Minnesota, by the American Anthropological Association
- John P. Miller, Yale University, by the American Economic Association
- C. Vann Woodward, Johns Hopkins University, by the American Historical Association
- Taylor Cole, Duke University, by the American Political Science Association
- Lyle H. Lanier, University of Illinois, by the American Psychological Association
- Robin M. Williams, Jr., Cornell University, by the American Sociological Society
- Frederick Mosteller, Harvard University, by the American Statistical Association.

The credentials of the new members are scheduled for acceptance by the board of directors of the Council at its spring meeting in New York on March 24-25, 1956.

SUMMER RESEARCH TRAINING INSTITUTES

Selection of applicants for admission to the four research training institutes to be conducted during the summer of 1956, under the auspices of the Committee on Research Training as announced in *Items*, December 1955, page 48, has been made by the following four subcommittees:

Current Research on International Affairs: John Gange, University of Virginia (chairman); Bernard C. Cohen, Princeton University; Alexander L. George, RAND Corporation.

Law and Social Relations: E. Adamson Hoebel, University of Minnesota (chairman); Harold J. Berman, Harvard University; Thomas H. Eliot, Washington University.

Quantitative Research Methods in Agricultural Eco-

nomics: Herman M. Southworth, Department of Agriculture (chairman); Earl O. Heady, Iowa State College; Lee R. Martin, North Carolina State College.

Survey Methods in Research on Health Problems: Shirley A. Star, University of Chicago (chairman); Theodore D. Woolsey, Public Health Service; Leo W. Simmons, Yale University.

The following persons have been invited to attend the respective institutes:

Current Research on International Affairs

Jack N. Behrman, Associate Professor of Economics, Washington and Lee University

Frank C. Child, Assistant Professor of Economics, Pomona College

John A. DeNovo, Associate Professor of History, Pennsylvania State University

Bernard C. Hennessy, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Arizona

John A. Houston, Associate Professor of International Relations and Political Science, Knox College

Norman Kogan, Assistant Professor of Government and International Relations, University of Connecticut

Shao Chuan Leng, Assistant Professor of Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia

Charles O. Lerche, Jr., Associate Professor of Political Science, Emory University

James N. Murray, Jr., Assistant Professor of Political Science, State University of Iowa

Benjamin Nimer, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University

William C. Olson, Assistant Professor of Government, Pomona College

E. Raymond Platig, Assistant Professor of International Relations, University of Denver (also to serve as assistant to the director of the institute)

Ralph E. Purcell, Professor of Government, Sweet Briar College

Paul Seabury, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley

Law and Social Relations

Robert G. Armstrong, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Atlanta University

William M. Beaney, Assistant Professor of Politics, Princeton University

Bernard S. Cohn, Social Sciences Assistant, Human Research Unit No. 3, U. S. Army, Columbus, Ga.

David Cooperman, Instructor, General Studies Department, University of Minnesota

F. James Davis, Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Wooster

Yehezkel Dror, graduate student, Harvard University

James L. Gibbs, Jr., Teaching Fellow in Anthropology, Harvard University

Saul H. Mendlovitz, Fellow, University of Chicago Law School

Arnold M. Rose, Professor of Sociology, University of Minnesota

Victor G. Rosenblum, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley

Richard D. Schwartz, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Yale University

Ellis L. Scott, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of New Mexico

Herbert J. Spiro, Instructor in Government, Harvard University

Rocco J. Tresolini, Associate Professor of Political Science, Lehigh University

Harold G. Wren, Professor of Law, University of Oklahoma

Quantitative Research Methods in Agricultural Economics

Walton J. Anderson, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of British Columbia

Warren R. Bailey, Assistant head, Western Field Research Section, Production Economics Research Branch, Department of Agriculture

Paul T. Blair, Assistant Agricultural Economist, Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station

Bill Bolton, Instructor and Research Associate in Agricultural Economics, Louisiana State University

George K. Brinegar, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Connecticut

Emery N. Castle, Assistant Agricultural Economist, Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station

Irving F. Fellows, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Connecticut

Charles E. French, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University

Roger W. Gray, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, Stanford University

Clive R. Harston, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, Montana State College

Harold A. Henderson, Agricultural Economist, Production Economics Research Branch, Department of Agriculture (cooperating with Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station)

Henry J. Hudek, Assistant Professor of Economics, Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College

John A. Kincannon, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College

Gordon A. King, Agricultural Analytical Statistician, Agricultural Economics Division, Department of Agriculture

Dale A. Knight, Assistant Agricultural Economist, Kansas State College

Daris G. Lafferty, Assistant Professor of Rural Economics, University of Arkansas

Alden C. Manchester, Agricultural Economist, Market Organization and Costs Branch, Department of Agriculture

Anthony G. Mathis, Agricultural Economist, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture

Robert S. McGlothlin, Assistant Agricultural Economist, University of Arizona

John W. Mellor, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University

Perry F. Philipp, Associate Agricultural Economist, Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station

Cecil N. Smith, Associate Agricultural Economist, Florida Agricultural Experiment Station

Raymond C. Smith, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Delaware

Hugh L. Stewart, Head, Northern Field Research Section, Production Economics Research Branch, Department of Agriculture
 Max M. Tharp, Assistant Head, Southern Field Research Section, Production Economics Research Branch, Department of Agriculture
 James Vermeer, Agricultural Economist, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture
 Morris L. Weinberger, Agricultural Economist, Production Economics Research Branch, Department of Agriculture
 Howard C. Williams, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, Ohio State University
 Roger C. Woodworth, Assistant Agricultural Economist, University of Georgia
 Philip A. Wright, Associate Professor of Farm Management, Ontario Agricultural College

Survey Methods in Research on Health Problems

Seymour S. Bellin, Associate Sociologist, Community Mental Health Research Unit, New York State Department of Mental Hygiene
 Warren Breed, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Tulane University
 James A. Davis, Research Associate in Public Health Practice, Harvard University
 Robert L. Eichhorn, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Purdue University
 Edward W. Hassinger, Instructor in Rural Sociology, University of Missouri
 Jacques Henripin, Professor of Demography and Statistics, University of Montreal

Jacob Katz, Research Associate (Sociology), United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston
 Irving Ladimer, Chief, Bureau of Special Studies, New York City Welfare and Health Council
 Sheldon G. Lowry, Assistant Professor of Rural Sociology, North Carolina State College
 H. William Mooney, Supervisor of California Health Survey, Bureau of Chronic Diseases, California State Department of Public Health
 Peter Kong-Ming New, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Missouri
 John Van D. Saunders, Assistant Sociologist, Mississippi State College Experiment Station
 Charles V. Willie, Instructor of Public Health and Preventive Medicine (Sociology), State University of New York College of Medicine, Syracuse

APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Lee R. Martin of North Carolina State College has been reappointed secretary of the Committee on Agricultural Economics.

Robert A. Dahl of Yale University and Dayton D. McKean of the University of Colorado have been appointed to the Committee on Political Behavior.

Stanley H. King of the University of Pittsburgh and John M. Weir of the Rockefeller Foundation have been appointed to the Committee on Preventive Medicine and Social Science Research.

PUBLICATIONS

COUNCIL MONOGRAPHS

Migration and Mental Disease: A Study of First Admissions to Hospitals for Mental Disease, New York, 1939-1941, by Benjamin Malzberg and Everett S. Lee, with an Introduction by Dorothy S. Thomas. Sponsored by the Committee on Migration Differentials. March 1956. 152 pages. \$1.50.

Labor Mobility in Six Cities: A Report on the Survey of Patterns and Factors in Labor Mobility, 1940-1950, prepared by Gladys L. Palmer, with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd, for the Committee on Labor Market Research. June 1954. 191 pages. Paper, \$2.25; cloth, \$2.75.

Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

Support for Independent Scholarship and Research, by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pages. \$1.25.

COUNCIL BULLETINS

Research on Labor Mobility: An Appraisal of Research Findings in the United States, Bulletin 65, by Herbert S. Parnes. October 1954. 216 pages. \$1.75.

The Social Sciences in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography, Bulletin 64. July 1954. 191 pages. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability, Bulletin 55, revised edition, by Roger G. Barker, in collaboration with Beatrice A. Wright, Lee Meyerson, Mollie R. Gonick. April 1953. 456 pages. \$2.00.

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pages. \$1.50.

Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted 1950. 116 pages. \$1.00.

Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pages. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

Labor-Management Relations: A Research Planning Memorandum, Bulletin 61, by John G. Turnbull. October 1949. 121 pages. \$1.25.

The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts, Bulletin 60, by Frederick Mosteller, Herbert Hyman, Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, David B. Truman, with the collaboration of L. W. Doob, Duncan MacRae, Jr., F. F. Stephan, S. A. Stouffer, S. S. Wilks. September 1949. 416 pages. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

COUNCIL PAMPHLETS

The Business Enterprise as a Subject for Research, Pamphlet 11, by Howard R. Bowen. Sponsored by the Committee on Business Enterprise Research. May 1955. 111 pages. \$1.25.

Bibliographies on Personality and Social Development of the Child, Pamphlet 10, compiled by Christoph Heinicke and Beatrice B. Whiting. June 1953. 138 pages. \$1.00.

Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education, Pamphlet 9, by Guy S. Métraux. June 1952. 58 pages. 50 cents.

The Council's monographs, bulletins, and pamphlets are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

These volumes are sponsored by the Committee on Census Monographs in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, and are published by John Wiley & Sons, New York:

American Agriculture: Its Structure and Place in the Economy, by Ronald L. Mighell. April 1955. 199 pages. Cloth, \$5.00.

Income of the American People, by Herman P. Miller. October 1955. 222 pages. Cloth, \$5.50.

Immigrants and Their Children, 1850-1950, by Edward P. Hutchinson. April 1956. 408 pages. Cloth, \$6.50.

Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950, by Otis Dudley Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. June 1956. 458 pages. \$6.50.

OTHER BOOKS

Economic Growth: Brazil, India, Japan, edited by Simon Kuznets, Wilbert E. Moore, and Joseph J. Spengler. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1955. 626 pages. Cloth, \$12.50.

Social Forces in the Middle East: Papers Presented at a Conference Sponsored by the Committee on the Near and Middle East, edited by Sidney N. Fisher. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, September 1955. 298 pages. Cloth, \$5.00.

The American Experience of Swedish Students: Retrospect and Aftermath, by Franklin D. Scott. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, June 1956. About 160 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

ANNOUNCEMENT

FULBRIGHT GRANTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC AREA, AND CHILE, 1957-58

The Committee on International Exchange of Persons, appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, has announced the 1957-58 competition for awards under the Fulbright Act (Public Law 584) for university lecturing and advanced research in Australia, New Zealand, Burma, Thailand, the Philippines, and India. A small interim program is also being announced for Chile, with the prospect that later in the year a regular competition for that country will take place. Application forms and

information on opportunities in the countries of the Pacific area may be obtained from the address given below and completed forms should be submitted by April 15, 1956.

In addition, the committee announces that 1957-58 grants for lecturing abroad under the Smith-Mundt Act (Public Law 402) will be available in approximately thirty countries in Latin America, the Near East and Africa, the Far East, and Europe. Persons interested in opportunities in these countries should communicate with the committee at the following address: Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D.C.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1956: TAYLOR COLE, FRED EGGAN, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, R. A. GORDON, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, PENDLETON HERRING, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, D. GALE JOHNSON, V. O. KEY, LYLE H. LANIER, EARL LATHAM, DONALD G. MARQUIS, JOHN P. MILLER, PHILIP E. MOSELY, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, FRANK C. NEWMAN, ROY F. NICHOLS, CARROLL L. SHARTLE, RICHARD H. SHRYOCK, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, CONRAD TAEUBER, ROBERT L. THORNDIKE, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, RALPH J. WATKINS, S. S. WILKS, GORDON R. WILLEY, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., C. VANN WOODWARD, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; ROBERT N. WILSON; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, *Financial Secretary*